arXiv:0809.0078v4 [quant-ph] 12 Feb 2009

Additive invariants on quantum channels and applications to regularized minimum entropy*

Shmuel Friedland
Department of Mathematics, Statistics, and Computer Science
University of Illinois at Chicago
Chicago, Illinois 60607-7045, USA
`E-mail: friedlan@uic.edu`

February 9, 2009

Abstract

We introduce two additive invariants of output quantum channels. If the value of one these invariants is less than 1 then the logarithm of the inverse of its value is a positive lower bound for the regularized minimum entropy of an output quantum channel. We give a few examples in which one of these invariants is less than 1. We also study the special cases where the above both invariants are equal to 1.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 81P68, 94A17, 94A40, 15A42,
Key words. Quantum information theory, quantum channel, minimum entropy output, regularized minimum entropy output, additivity conjecture, additive invariants.

1 Introduction

Denote by $\mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C})$ the Hilbert space of $n \times n$ hermitian matrices, where $\langle X, Y\rangle = \operatorname{tr} XY$. Denote by $\mathcal{S}_{n,+,1}(\mathbb{C}) \subset \mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{C}) \subset \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C})$ the convex set of positive hermitian matrices of trace one, and the cone of positive hermitian matrices respectively. A quantum channel is a completely positive linear transformation $\tau : \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C})$:

$$\tau(X) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} A_i X A_i^*, \quad A_1, \ldots, A_l \in \mathbb{C}^{m\times n},\ X \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}), \tag{1.1}$$

which is trace preserving:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{l} A_i^* A_i = I_n, \tag{1.2}$$

The *minimum* entropy output of a quantum channel τ is defined

$$\mathrm{H}(\tau) = \min_{X\in\mathcal{S}_{n,+,1}(\mathbb{C})} -\operatorname{tr} \tau(X) \log \tau(X). \tag{1.3}$$

---

[*] This research started during author's participation in AIM workshop "Geometry and representation theory of tensors for computer science, statistics and other areas", July 21-25, 2008.

If $\eta : \mathcal{S}_{n'}(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathcal{S}_{m'}(\mathbb{C})$ is another quantum channel, then it is well known $\tau \otimes \eta$ is a quantum channel, and

$$\mathrm{H}(\tau \otimes \eta) \le \mathrm{H}(\tau) + \mathrm{H}(\eta). \tag{1.4}$$

Hence the sequence $\mathrm{H}(\otimes^p \tau), p = 1, \ldots,$ is subadditive. Thus the following limit exists:

$$\mathrm{H}_r(\tau) = \lim_{p\to\infty} \frac{\mathrm{H}(\otimes^p \tau)}{p}, \tag{1.5}$$

and is called the *regularized* minimum entropy of quantum channel. Clearly, $\mathrm{H}_r(\tau) \le \mathrm{H}(\tau)$.

One of the major open problem of quantum information theory is the additivity conjecture, which claims that equality holds in (1.4). This additivity conjecture has several equivalent forms [10]. If the additivity conjecture holds then $\mathrm{H}_r(\tau) = \mathrm{H}(\tau)$, and the computation of $\mathrm{H}_r(\tau)$ is relatively simple. There are known cases where the additivity conjecture is known, see references in [8]. It is also known that the p analog of the additivity conjecture is wrong [8]. It was shown in [2] that the additivity of the entanglement of subspaces fails over the real numbers. It was recently shown by Hastings [6] that the additivity conjecture is false. Hence the computation of $\mathrm{H}_r(\tau)$ is hard. This is the standard situation in computing the entropy of Potts models in statistical physics, e.g. [4].

The first major result of this paper gives a nontrivial lower bound on $\mathrm{H}_r(\tau)$ for certain quantum channels. This is done by introducing two additive invariants on quantum channels. Let

$$\mathbf{A}(\tau) := \sum_{i=1}^{l} A_i A_i^* \in \mathcal{S}_{m,+}(\mathbb{C}). \tag{1.6}$$

Then $\log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) = \log \|\mathbf{A}(\tau)\|$, where $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A})$ is the maximal eigenvalue of $\mathbf{A}(\tau)$, is the first additive invariant of quantum channels, with respect to tensor products. Let $\sigma_1(\tau) = \|\tau\| \ge \sigma_2(\tau) \ge \ldots \ge 0$ be the first and the second singular value of the linear transformation given by τ. Then $\log \sigma_1(\tau)$ is the second additive invariant. (These two invariants are incomparable in general, see §5.) The main result of this paper is the inequality

$$\mathrm{H}_r(\tau) \ge \max(-\log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)), -\log \sigma_1(\tau)).$$

This inequality is nontrivial only if $\min(\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)), \sigma_1(\tau)) < 1$. In §5 section we give examples where $\min(\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)), \sigma_1(\tau)) < 1$. If $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) < 1$ then the inequality $\mathrm{H}_r(\tau) \ge -\log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau))$ can be improved, see §4.

It is easy to show that $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) \ge \frac{n}{m}$ and $\sigma_1(\tau) \ge \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}}$, see Proposition 4.2. Hence, for $m \le n$ we must have $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)), \sigma_1(\tau) \ge 1$. Perhaps, the most interesting case is the case where $m = n$. Furthermore, very interesting quantum channels τ are *unitary* quantum channels, which are of the form (1.1), where

$$A_i = t_i Q_i,\ Q_i Q_i^* = Q_i^* Q_i = I_n,\ i = 1, \ldots, l,\ \mathbf{t} = (t_1, \ldots, t_l)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^l, \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{t} = 1. \tag{1.7}$$

In that case $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) = \sigma_1(\tau) = 1$. Note the counter example to the additivity conjecture in [6] is of this form. A quantum channel $\tau : \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C})$ is called a *bi*-quantum channel if $m = n$ and $\tau^* : \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C})$ is also a quantum channel.

That is $\mathbf{A}(\tau) = I_n$ and it follows that $\sigma_1(\tau) = 1$. Note that a unitary quantum channel is a bi-quantum channel. The second major result of this paper is the lower bound

$$\mathrm{H}(\otimes^p \tau) \ge -\frac{1}{2}\log(\sigma_2(\tau)^2 + \frac{1-\sigma_2(\tau)^2}{n^p}),\ p = 1, \ldots,$$

for a bi-quantum channel. Note that this lower is nontrivial if $\sigma_2(\tau) < 1$. We show that the condition $\sigma_2(\tau) < 1$ holds for a generic unitary channel with $l \ge 3$.

2 Preliminary results

Let $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$ be the field of real and complex numbers respectively, and denote by $\mathbb{F}^n$ the vector space of the column vectors $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)^\top$ with coordinates in $\mathbb{F}$. We view $\mathbb{F}^n$ as an inner product space, i.e. *Hilbert space* $\mathcal{H}_A$, with the inner product $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle := \mathbf{y}^* \mathbf{x} = \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{y}_j x_j$.

View $\mathbb{F}^m \otimes \mathbb{F}^n$ as the set of $m \times n$ matrices with entries in $\mathbb{F}$, denoted by $\mathbb{F}^{m\times n}$. Equivalently, if we identify $\mathbb{F}^m$ with the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_B$ then $\mathbb{F}^{m\times n} \approx \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_A$. Recall that on $\mathbb{F}^{m\times n}$ we have the inner product $\langle A, B \rangle := \operatorname{tr} AB^*$, where $B^* = A^\top$ if $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ and $B^* = (\bar{B})^\top$ if $B \in \mathbb{C}^{m\times n}$.

Denote by $\mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{F}) \subset \mathbb{F}^{n\times n}$ the real space of self-adjoint matrices. I.e. $\mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$ is the space of real symmetric matrices, and $\mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C})$ is the space of hermitian matrices. Let $X \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{F})$. Denote by $\boldsymbol{\lambda}(A) = (\lambda_1(X), \ldots, \lambda_n(X))$ the eigenvalue set of X, where $\lambda_1(A) \ge \ldots \ge \lambda_n(X)$. Then $\mathbf{u}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_n$ is the corresponding orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{F}^n$ consisting of eigenvectors of X

$$X\mathbf{u}_i = \lambda_i(X)\mathbf{u}_i,\ \mathbf{u}_i^*\mathbf{u}_j = \delta_{ij}, \quad i, j = 1, \ldots, n.$$

Ky-Fan maximal characterization is, e.g. [3],

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(X) = \max_{\mathbf{x}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{x}_k \in \mathbb{C}^n, \mathbf{x}_p^*\mathbf{x}_q = \delta_{pq}} \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{x}_j^* X \mathbf{x}_j = \sum_{j=1}^k \operatorname{tr}(X(\mathbf{x}_j\mathbf{x}_j^*)). \tag{2.1}$$

As in physics, we call $X \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{F})$ a *positive* hermitian matrix, or simply positive, and denoted it by $X \ge 0$, if all eigenvalues of X are nonnegative. Also for $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{F})$ we let $Y \ge X$ if $Y - X \ge 0$. Denote by $\mathcal{S}_{n,+,1}(\mathbb{F}) \subset \mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{F}) \subset \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{F})$ the convex set of positive hermitian matrices of trace one, and the cone of positive hermitian matrices respectively.

Let $A \in \mathbb{F}^{m\times n}$. Then the positive singular values of A are the positive eigenvalues of $\sqrt{AA^*}$, which are equal to the positive eigenvalues $\sqrt{A^*A}$. Let $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(A) = (\sigma_1(A), \sigma_2(A), \ldots, \sigma_l(A))^\top$ be the vector of singular values of $A \in \mathbb{F}^{m\times n}$, where $\sigma_1(A) \ge \sigma_2(A) \ge \ldots \ge \sigma_l(A) \ge 0$ are the singular values of A arranged in the decreasing order. We do not fix the number of coordinates l in $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(A)$, but recall that $\sigma_i(A) = 0$ if $i > \min(m, n)$. (So $l \ge \min(m, n)$.) There exists an orthonormal bases $\mathbf{u}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_n \in \mathbb{C}^n, \mathbf{v}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_m \in \mathbb{C}^m$, called right and left singular vectors of A, such that

$$\begin{aligned} &A\mathbf{u}_i = \sigma_i(A)\mathbf{v}_i,\ A^*\mathbf{v}_i = \sigma_i(A)\mathbf{u}_i,\ i = 1, \text{rank } A,\ A\mathbf{u}_i = \mathbf{0}, A^*\mathbf{v}_i = \mathbf{0} \text{ for } i > \text{rank } A, \\ &\mathbf{u}_i^*\mathbf{u}_j = \delta_{ij},\ i, j = 1, \ldots, n, \quad \mathbf{v}_p^*\mathbf{v}_q = \delta_{pq},\ p, q = 1, \ldots, m. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

Note that the Frobenius norm $\|A\|_F := \sqrt{\langle A, A\rangle} = \sqrt{\mathrm{tr}(AA^*)}$ is equal to $\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{\mathrm{rank}\, A} \sigma_i(A)^2}$.

Assume that $X \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{F})$. Then the singular values of X are the absolute values of the eigenvalues of X. In particular, for $X \in \mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{F})$ we have that $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X) = \boldsymbol{\lambda}(X)$.

Recall the well known maximal characterization of the sum of the first k singular values of $A \in \mathbb{F}^{m\times n}$ [7, Thm 3.4.1].

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} \sigma_j(A) = \max_{\mathbf{x}_p\in\mathbb{F}^n, \mathbf{y}_q\in\mathbb{F}^m, \mathbf{x}_p^*\mathbf{x}_q=\mathbf{y}_p^*\mathbf{y}_q=\delta_{pq}, p,q=1,\ldots,k} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathbf{y}_j^* A\mathbf{x}_j, \tag{2.3}$$

for $k = 1, \ldots, \min(m, n)$. Note that $\sigma_1(A) = \|A\| = \max_{\mathbf{x}^*\mathbf{x}=1} \|A\mathbf{x}\|$, where $\|A\|$ is the ℓ_2 norm of A. A useful observation is

$$\mathbf{y}^* A\mathbf{x} = \mathrm{tr}(A(\mathbf{x}\mathbf{y}^*)) = \mathrm{tr}(A(\mathbf{y}\mathbf{x}^*)^*) = \mathrm{tr}((\mathbf{x}\mathbf{y}^*)A). \tag{2.4}$$

For any nonnegative vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)^\top \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ denote by

$$\mathrm{H}(\mathbf{x}) := -\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_i \log x_i.$$

Let $\Pi_n \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ be the set of probability vectors with n-coordinates. Then $\mathrm{H}(\mathbf{x})$ is the entropy of a probability vector $\mathbf{x}$. For $X \in \mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{F})$ we define the von Neumann entropy

$$\mathrm{H}(X) := \mathrm{H}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}(X)) = -\mathrm{tr}\, X \log X.$$

Note that if $X \in \mathcal{S}_{n,+,1}(\mathbb{F})$ then $\mathrm{H}(X) = 0$ if and only if X is a rank one nonnegative definite matrix with trace 1.

It is well known that if $\phi : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ is a convex function then

$$\phi : \mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{F}) \to \mathbb{R}, \quad \phi(X) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \phi(\lambda_i(X)),\ X \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{F})$$

is a convex function on $\mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{F})$. See for example [3]. This fact is implied by the *majorization* relation

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}(aX + bY) \prec a\boldsymbol{\lambda}(X) + b\boldsymbol{\lambda}(Y), \quad a, b \in \mathbb{R}_+, X, Y \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{F}),$$

which is equivalent to

$$\sum_{j=1}^{i} \lambda_j(aX + bY) \le \sum_{j=1}^{i} (a\lambda_j(X) + b\lambda_j(Y)), \quad i = 1, \ldots, n-1,$$

and the trace equality $\mathrm{tr}(aX + bY) = a\,\mathrm{tr}\, X + b\,\mathrm{tr}\, Y$. See [5, 9] for good references on majorization. In particular, $-\mathrm{H}(X) = \mathrm{tr}(X \log X)$ is a convex function on $\mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{F})$.

In what follows it is convenient to identify $\mathbb{F}^{m_1\times n_1} \otimes \mathbb{F}^{m_2\times n_2}$ with $\mathbb{F}^{(m_1m_2)\times(n_1n_2)}$. Assume that $X_i = [x_{pq,i}]_{p=q=1}^{m_i,n_i} \in \mathbb{F}^{m_i\times n_i}$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then we identify $X_1 \otimes X_2$ with the Kronecker product, which is viewed as $(m_1m_2) \times (n_1n_2)$ matrix given as a block matrix $[x_{pq,1}X_2]_{p=q=1}^{m_1,n_1}$. So $X_1 \otimes X_2$ maps $\mathbb{F}^{n_1n_2}$ to $\mathbb{F}^{m_1m_2}$. Identify $\mathbb{F}^{mn}$ with the matrix space $\mathbb{F}^{n\times m}$. Then

$$(X_1 \otimes X_2)(Y) = X_2 Y X_1^\top, \quad Y \in \mathbb{F}^{n_2\times n_1}. \tag{2.5}$$

Recall the well known fact that rank $(X_1 \otimes X_2) =$ rank X_1rank X_2. Furthermore, all positive singular values of $X_1 \otimes X_2$ are of the form [7, Thm 4.2.15]

$$\sigma_i(X_1)\sigma_j(X_2), \quad i = 1, \ldots, \text{rank } X_1,\ j = 1, \ldots, \text{rank } X_2.$$

In particular

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_1(X_1 \otimes X_2) &= \sigma_1(X_1)\sigma_1(X_2), \\ \sigma_{\text{rank } X_1 \otimes X_2}(X_1 \otimes X_2) &= \sigma_{\text{rank } X_1}(X_1)\sigma_{\text{rank } X_2}(X_2). \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Hence we have the additivity of the entropy formula

$$\mathrm{H}(X_1 \otimes X_2) = \mathrm{H}(X_1) + \mathrm{H}(X_2) \text{ for } X_i \in \mathcal{S}_{n_i,+,1}(\mathbb{F}),\ i = 1, 2, \tag{2.7}$$

3 Main inequalities

In this section we view $\mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C})$ as $\mathbb{R}^{n^2}$. The real inner product on $\mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C})$ is given by $\langle X_1, X_2\rangle = \operatorname{tr}(X_1X_2^*) = \operatorname{tr}(X_1X_2)$. Let $\phi : \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C})$ be a linear, (real), transformation. We now apply the notions discussed in the previous section. The adjoint linear transformation $\phi^* : \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C})$ is given by the identity

$$\operatorname{tr}(\phi(X)Y) = \operatorname{tr}(X\phi^*(Y)) \text{ for all } X \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}),\ Y \in \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C}).$$

The positive singular values of ϕ are the positive eigenvalues of $(\phi\phi^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ or of $(\phi^*\phi)^{\frac{1}{2}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_i(\phi) = \sigma_i(\phi^*) = (\lambda_i(\phi\phi^*))^{\frac{1}{2}} = (\lambda_i(\phi^*\phi))^{\frac{1}{2}}\ i = 1, \ldots, \text{rank } \phi, \\ \sigma_i(\phi) = \sigma_i(\phi^*) = 0 \text{ for } i > \text{rank } \phi. \end{aligned}$$

We will denote $\sigma_i(\phi)$ by σ_i where no ambiguity arises. Furthermore, there exist orthonormal bases $\{U_1, \ldots, U_{n^2}\}, \{V_1, \ldots, V_{m^2}\}$ of $\mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}), \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C})$ respectively, such that the following conditions hold.

$$\phi(U_i) = \sigma_iV_i,\ \phi_i^*(V_i) = \sigma_iU_i, \quad \phi(U_i) = 0,\ \phi_i^*(V_i) = 0 \text{ for } i > \text{rank } \phi, \tag{3.1}$$

$$\operatorname{tr}(U_iU_j) = \delta_{ij} \text{ for } i, j = 1, \ldots, n, \quad \operatorname{tr}(V_pV_q) = \delta_{pq} \text{ for } p, q = 1, \ldots, m. \tag{3.2}$$

Combine the well known expression of $\operatorname{tr}\phi(X)^2 = \|\phi(X)\|^2$ in terms of singular values and vectors of ϕ to deduce

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \lambda_i(\phi(X))^2 = \|\phi(X)\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{\text{rank } \phi} \sigma_i^2|\operatorname{tr} U_iX|^2 \text{ for any } X \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}). \tag{3.3}$$

If $m = n$ and ϕ is self-adjoint, i.e. $\operatorname{tr}(\phi(X)Y) = \operatorname{tr}(X\phi(Y))$, then the singular values of ϕ are the absolute values of the eigenvalues of ϕ. If an addition ϕ is positive operator, i.e. $\operatorname{tr}(\phi(X)X) \geq 0$, the singular values of ϕ are the eigenvalues of ϕ. In that case in (3.1) we assume that $X_i = Y_i, i = 1, \ldots, n$. The maximal characterization (2.3) is

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \sigma_i(\phi) = \max_{X_1,\ldots,X_k \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}), Y_1,\ldots,Y_k \in \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C}), \operatorname{tr}(X_iX_j) = \operatorname{tr}(Y_iY_j) = \delta_{ij}} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \operatorname{tr}(\phi(X_i)Y_i), \tag{3.4}$$

for $k = 1, \ldots, \min(m, n)$. If $m = n$ and ϕ is self-adjoint and positive we assume that $X_i = Y_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$. Note that $\sigma_1(\phi) = \|\phi\|$.

A linear mapping $\phi : \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C})$ is called *positive preserving* if $\phi(\mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{C})) \subset \mathcal{S}_{m,+}(\mathbb{C})$. Since $\mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{C})$ is a self-adjoint cone, it follows ϕ is positive preserving if and only if ϕ^* is positive preserving. In particular, if ϕ is positive preserving, then the positive operators $\phi\phi^*$ and $\phi^*\phi$ are positive and positive preserving operators. Assume that ϕ is positive preserving. The Krein-Rutman theorem cone preserving theorem, e.g. [1], imply that in (3.1) we can choose $U_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{n.+}(\mathbb{C}), V_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{m,+}(\mathbb{C})$. If ϕ is *strict positive preserving*, i.e. for each $0 \neq X \in \mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{C})$ $\phi(X)$ has positive eigenvalues, then $U_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{C}), V_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{m,+}(\mathbb{C})$ are unique. See for example [1].

A ϕ is called trace preserving if ϕ is cone preserving, and $\mathrm{tr}(\phi(X)) = \mathrm{tr}(X)$ for all $X \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C})$. Note that for a trace preserving ϕ we have $\phi(\mathcal{S}_{n,+,1}) \subset \mathcal{S}_{m,+,1}$.

Recall that a linear operator $\tau : \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C})$ is called *completely positive* if (1.1) holds. In Kronecker notation (2.5)

$$\tau = \sum_{i=1}^{l} \bar{A}_i \otimes A_i. \tag{3.5}$$

(Note that the complex space $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ is $\mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}) + (\sqrt{-1})\mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C})$, and τ is a *real* transformation.) Observe that if $A_1, \ldots, A_l \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ then $\tau(\mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})) \subset \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{R})$. Clearly, completely positive operator is cone preserving. Furthermore,

$$\tau^*(Y) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} A_i^* Y A_i \text{ where } Y \in \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C}). \tag{3.6}$$

Observe that

$$\mathrm{tr}\,\tau(X) = \mathrm{tr}(X\mathbf{A}'), \quad \mathbf{A}' := \sum_{i=1}^{l} A_i^* A_i. \tag{3.7}$$

Hence τ is trace preserving if and only if $\mathbf{A}' = I_n$. We will assume the condition (1.2), unless stated otherwise. Such a mapping τ is called *a quantum channel.*

Theorem 3.1 *Let $\tau : \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C})$ be a linear transformation. Then, for all $k = 1, \ldots, m$, we have*

$$\max_{X\in\mathcal{S}_{n,+,1}} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \lambda_j(\tau(X)) = \max_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{C}^n, \mathbf{y}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{y}_k\in\mathbb{C}^m, \mathbf{x}^*\mathbf{x}=1, \mathbf{y}_p^*\mathbf{y}_q=\delta_{pq}} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathrm{tr}(\tau(\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^*)(\mathbf{y}_j\mathbf{y}_j^*)). \tag{3.8}$$

In particular

$$\max_{X\in\mathcal{S}_{n,+,1}} \lambda_1(\tau(X)) \le \sigma_1(\tau). \tag{3.9}$$

Assume furthermore that τ is completely positive, i.e. (1.1) holds. Then, for all $k = 1, \ldots, m$, we have

$$\max_{X\in\mathcal{S}_{n,+,1}} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \lambda_j(\tau(X)) = \tag{3.10}$$

$$\max_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{C}^n, \mathbf{y}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{y}_k\in\mathbb{C}^m, \mathbf{x}^*\mathbf{x}=1, \mathbf{y}_p^*\mathbf{y}_q=\delta_{pq}} \sum_{i,j=1}^{l,k} |\mathbf{y}_j^* A_i \mathbf{x}|^2.$$

In particular,

$$\max_{X\in\mathcal{S}_{n,+,1}}\sum_{j=1}^{k}\lambda_j(\tau(X))\le\sum_{j=1}^{k}\lambda_j(\mathbf{A}(\tau)),\quad j=1,\ldots,m, \tag{3.11}$$

where $\mathbf{A}(\tau)$ *is given by (1.6).*

Proof. (2.1) yields that $\sum_{j=1}^{k}\lambda_j(Y)$ is a convex function on $\mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C})$, e.g. [3]. Therefore, $\sum_{j=1}^{k}\lambda_i(\tau(X))$ is a convex function on $\mathcal{S}_{n,+,1}$. Since the extreme points of $\mathcal{S}_{n,+,1}$ are $\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{C}^n, \mathbf{x}^*\mathbf{x}=1$, we obtain

$$\max_{X\in\mathcal{S}_{n,+,1}}\sum_{j=1}^{k}\lambda_j(\tau(X))=\max_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{C}^n,\mathbf{x}^*\mathbf{x}=1}\sum_{j=1}^{k}\lambda_j(\tau(\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^*)).$$

Combine this equality with (2.1) to deduce (3.8). Compare the maximum characterization (3.4) of $\sigma_1(\tau)$ with (3.8), $(k=1)$, to deduce (3.9).

Assume now that (1.1) holds. Note that

$$\mathrm{tr}((A_i\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^*A_i^*)\mathbf{y}_j\mathbf{y}_j^*)=\mathrm{tr}((\mathbf{y}_j^*A_i\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{x}^*A_i^*\mathbf{y}_j))=|\mathbf{y}_j^*A_i\mathbf{x}|^2.$$

Hence, for completely positive operator (3.8) is equivalent to (3.10). The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields

$$|\mathbf{y}_j^*A_i\mathbf{x}|^2=|(A_i^*\mathbf{y}_j)^*\mathbf{x}|^2\le\|A_i^*\mathbf{y}_j\|^2\|\mathbf{x}\|^2=\mathbf{y}_j^*A_iA_i^*\mathbf{y}_j.$$

Hence, the left-hand side of (3.10) is bounded above by

$$\max_{\mathbf{y}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{y}_k\in\mathbb{C}^n,\mathbf{y}_p^*\mathbf{y}_q=\delta_{pq}}\sum_{j=1}^{k}\mathbf{y}_j^*\mathbf{A}(\tau)\mathbf{y}_j.$$

(2.1) yield that the above maximum is equal to $\sum_{j=1}^{k}\lambda_j(\mathbf{A}(\tau))$, which implies (3.11). □

4 Lower bounds on minimal entropies

Recall that minimum entropy output of a quantum channel τ, denoted by $\mathrm{H}(\tau)$, is defined by (1.3). Since $\mathrm{H}(Y)$ is a concave function on $\mathcal{S}_{m,+}(\mathbb{F})$, and the extreme points of $\mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{F})$ are of the form $\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^*$, where $\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{F}^n$ and $\mathbf{x}^*\mathbf{x}=1$ it follows that

$$\mathrm{H}(\tau)=\min_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{C}^n,\mathbf{x}^*\mathbf{x}=1}\mathrm{H}(\tau(\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^*)). \tag{4.1}$$

Assume $\tau_j:\mathcal{S}_{n_j}(\mathbb{C})\to\mathcal{S}_{m_j}(\mathbb{C}), j=1,2$ are two quantum channels:

$$\tau_j(X_j)=\sum_{i=1}^{l_j}A_{i,j}X_jA_{i,j}^*,\ A_{i,j}\in\mathbb{C}^{m_j\times n_j},\ i=1,\ldots,l_j,\ j=1,2. \tag{4.2}$$

I.e.

$$\tau_j = \sum_{i_j=1}^{l_j} \bar{A}_{i_j,j} \otimes A_{i_j,j}, \quad j = 1, 2.$$

Then $\tau_1 \otimes \tau_2$ is quantum channel since

$$\tau_1 \otimes \tau_2 = \sum_{i_1=i_2=}^{l_1,l_2} (\bar{A}_{i_1,1} \otimes \bar{A}_{i_2}) \otimes (A_{i_1,1} \otimes A_{i_2}). \tag{4.3}$$

Also, it is straightforward to check that

$$\mathbf{A}(\tau_1 \otimes \tau_2) = \mathbf{A}(\tau_1) \otimes \mathbf{A}(\tau_2). \tag{4.4}$$

Hence

$$\log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau_1 \otimes \tau_2)) = \log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau_1)) + \log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau_2)). \tag{4.5}$$

Thus $\log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau))$ is the first additive invariant on quantum channels. Note that

$$\mathcal{S}_{n_1}(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{S}_{n_2}(\mathbb{C}) \subset \mathcal{S}_{n_1 n_2}(\mathbb{C}), \quad \mathcal{S}_{n_1,+,1}(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{S}_{n_2,+,1}(\mathbb{C}) \subset \mathcal{S}_{n_1 n_2,+,1}(\mathbb{C}).$$

Hence we obtain that the minimum entropy output of quantum channels is subadditive (1.4). The additivity conjecture in quantum information theory states that equality always holds in (1.4) [10].

Let $\tau : \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C})$ be a quantum channel. Then the sequence $\mathrm{H}(\otimes^p \tau)$ is subadditive:

$$\mathrm{H}(\otimes^{p+q} \tau) \le \mathrm{H}(\otimes^p \tau) + \mathrm{H}(\otimes^q \tau) \text{ for all integers } p, q \ge 1.$$

Hence the limit (1.5) exists.

The aim of this paper to give a nontrivial lower bound on $\mathrm{H}_r(\tau)$ for certain quantum channels. Assume that τ_1, τ_2 are two quantum channels given by (4.2). Viewing τ_1, τ_2 as linear transformation we get

$$\log \|\tau_1 \otimes \tau_2\| = \log \sigma_1(\tau_1 \otimes \tau_2) = \log \sigma_1(\tau_1) + \log \sigma_1(\tau_2) = \log \|\tau_1\| + \log \|\tau_2\|. \tag{4.6}$$

Hence, $\log \|\tau\|$ is the second additive invariant on quantum channels.

Theorem 4.1 *Let* $\tau : \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C})$ *be a quantum channel. Assume that* $\min(\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)), \|\tau\|) < 1$. *Then*

$$\mathrm{H}_r(\tau) \ge \max(-\log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)), -\log \|\tau\|). \tag{4.7}$$

Proof. Let $Y \in \mathcal{S}_{m,+,1}(\mathbb{C})$. Since $\lambda_1(Y) \ge \ldots \ge \lambda_m(Y) \ge 0$

$$\mathrm{H}(Y) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \lambda_i(Y) \log \frac{1}{\lambda_i(Y)} \ge \sum_{i=1}^{m} \lambda_i(Y) \log \frac{1}{\lambda_1(Y)} \ge -\log \lambda_1(Y).$$

(3.11) for $k = 1$, (4.4) and (3.9) yield

$$\mathrm{H}(\otimes^p \tau) \ge -\log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\otimes^p \tau)) = -\log \lambda_1(\otimes^p \mathbf{A}(\tau)) = -p \log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)),$$
$$\mathrm{H}(\otimes^p \tau) \ge -\log \sigma_1(\otimes^p \tau) = -p \log \sigma_1(\tau) = -p \log \|\tau\|$$

Hence (4.7) holds. □

Note that the proof of the above theorem yields that (4.7) always holds. However if $\min(\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)), \|\tau\|) \ge 1$ then the inequality (4.7) is trivial.

Proposition 4.2 *Let τ be a quantum channel given by (1.1). Then*

$$\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) \ge \frac{n}{m}, \quad \sigma_1(\tau) \ge \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}}. \tag{4.8}$$

Hence, $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)), \sigma_1(\tau) \ge 1$ for $m \le n$. In particular, if $m \le n$ then the condition either $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) = 1$ or $\sigma_1(\tau) = 1$ holds if and only if $m = n$ and τ^* is a quantum channel.

Proof. Clearly,

$$m\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) \ge \sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_j(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) = \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{A}(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} \operatorname{tr} A_i A_i^* = \sum_{i=1}^{l} \operatorname{tr} A_i^* A_i = \operatorname{tr} I_n = n.$$

Hence $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) \ge \frac{n}{m}$. Clearly, if $m = n$ and $\mathbf{A}(\tau) = I_n$ then $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) = 1$ and τ^* is a quantum channel. Vice versa if $m \le n$ and $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) = 1$ then $m = n$. Furthermore, all eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A}(\tau)$ have to be equal to 1, i.e. $\mathbf{A}(\tau) = I_n$.

Observe that the condition that τ of the form (1.1) is a quantum channel is equivalent to the condition $\tau^*(I_m) = I_n$. As

$$\sigma_1(\tau) = \sigma_1(\tau^*) \ge \|\tau^*(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} I_m)\| = \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}}$$

we deduce that second inequality in (4.8). Suppose that $m \le n$ and $\sigma_1(\tau) = 1$. Hence $m = n$ and $\sigma_1(\tau^*) = \|\tau^*(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} I_n)\| = 1$. So $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} I_n$ must be the left and the right singular vector of τ corresponding to the $\|\tau\|$. I.e. $\tau(I_n) = I_n$, which is equivalent to the condition that τ^* is a quantum channel. $\square$

In the next sections we will give examples for which $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) < 1$. In that case we can improve the lower bound for $\mathrm{H}_r(\tau) \ge -\log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau))$. Denote by $m' \ge 1$ the smallest positive integer that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m'} \lambda_i(\mathbf{A}) \ge 1. \tag{4.9}$$

Since τ is trace preserving (3.11) yields that $m' \ge m$. Note that $m' > 1$ if and only if $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) < 1$. Assume first that $m' > 1$. Let

$$\mathrm{F}(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) = -\eta(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) \log \eta(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) - \sum_{i=1}^{m'-1} \lambda_i(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) \log \lambda_i(\mathbf{A}(\tau)), \tag{4.10}$$

$$\text{where } \eta(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{m'-1} \lambda_i(\mathbf{A}(\tau)).$$

Note that in this case $0 \le \eta(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) \le \lambda_{m'}(\mathbf{A}(\tau))$. Hence

$$F(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) \ge -\log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)). \tag{4.11}$$

If $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) \ge 1$ we let $\mathrm{F}(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) = 0$.

Theorem 4.3 *Let τ be a quantum channel given by (1.1). Let $\mathbf{A}(\tau)$ be given by (1.6) and assume that* $\mathrm{F}(\mathbf{A}(\tau))$ *is defined as above. Then*

$$\mathrm{H}_r(\tau) \ge \limsup_{p\to\infty} \frac{\mathrm{F}(\otimes^p \mathbf{A}(\tau))}{p}. \tag{4.12}$$

Proof. If $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}) \ge 1$ then $\lambda_1(\otimes^p\mathbf{A}(\tau)) = \lambda_1(\mathbf{A})^p \ge 1$ and $F(\otimes^p\mathbf{A}(\tau)) = 0$. In that case (4.12) is trivial.

Assume that $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) < 1$. Let

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) := (\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)), \dots, \lambda_{m'-1}(\mathbf{A}(\tau)), \eta(\mathbf{A}(\tau)), \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{m-m'})^\top \in \mathbb{R}_+^m.$$

(3.11) implies that $\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\tau(X)) \prec \boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathbf{A}(\tau))$ for each $X \in \mathcal{S}_{n,+,1}$. Since $x\log x$ is convex on $\mathbb{R}_+$ it follows that $-\mathrm{H}(\tau(X)) \le -\mathrm{F}(\mathbf{A}(\tau))$. Hence $\mathrm{H}(\tau) \ge \mathrm{F}(\mathbf{A}(\tau)$. Similarly

$$\mathrm{H}(\otimes^p\tau) \ge \mathrm{F}(\mathbf{A}(\otimes^p\tau)) = \mathrm{F}(\otimes^p\mathbf{A}(\tau)).$$

Hence (4.12) holds in this case. □

We remark that the inequality (4.11) shows that (4.12) is an improvement of the inequality $\mathrm{H}_r(\tau) \ge -\log\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau))$ when $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) < 1$. Since the eigenvalues of $\otimes^p\mathbf{A}(\tau)$ are rearranged coordinates of the vector $\otimes^p\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\mathbf{A}(\tau))$, it should not be too difficult to find the exact formula of the right-hand side of (4.12) in terms of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\mathbf{A}(\tau))$.

5 Examples

Example 1. A quantum channel $\tau : \mathcal{S}_1(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C})$ is of the form

$$\tau(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} \mathbf{a}_i x \mathbf{a}_i^*, \quad \mathbf{a}_i \in \mathbb{C}^m, i = 1, \dots, l, \ \sum_{i=1}^{l} \mathbf{a}_i^* \mathbf{a}_i = 1, \quad \mathbf{A}(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} \mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{a}_i^*. \tag{5.1}$$

Note that $\operatorname{tr}\mathbf{A}(\tau) = 1$. Hence $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) < 1$, unless $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_l$ are colinear. (This happens always if $m = 1$.)

We claim that

$$\sigma_1(\tau) = \sqrt{\operatorname{tr}\mathbf{A}(\tau)^2}. \tag{5.2}$$

Indeed

$$\max_{|x|=1, Y\in\mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C}), \operatorname{tr}(Y^2)=1} |\operatorname{tr}\tau(x)Y| = \max_{Y\in\mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C}), \operatorname{tr}(Y^2)=1} |\operatorname{tr}\mathbf{A}(\tau)Y| = \sqrt{\operatorname{tr}\mathbf{A}(\tau)^2}.$$

Hence

$$\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) < \sigma_1(\tau) < 1 \text{ iff } \mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_l \text{ are not colinear.} \tag{5.3}$$

If $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_l$ are co-linear then $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}) = \sigma_1(\mathbf{A}) = 1$. Note that in this example $\mathrm{H}(\tau) = \mathrm{H}(\mathbf{A}(\tau))$.

Example 2. A quantum channel $\tau : \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathcal{S}_1(\mathbb{C})$ is of the form

$$\tau(X) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} \mathbf{a}_i^* X \mathbf{a}_i, \quad \mathbf{a}_i \in \mathbb{C}^n, i = 1, \ldots, l, \ \sum_{i=1}^{l} \mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{a}_i^* = I_n, \quad \mathbf{A}(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} \mathbf{a}_i^* \mathbf{a}_i = n. \tag{5.4}$$

So $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) = n \geq 1$. On the other hand

$$\sigma_1(\tau) = \max_{X \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}), \operatorname{tr} X^2 = 1, |y|=1} |\operatorname{tr}(\tau(X)y)| = \max_{X \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}), \operatorname{tr} X^2 = 1} |\operatorname{tr} X| = \sqrt{n}. \tag{5.5}$$

So for $n > 1$ $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) > \sigma_1(\tau)$.

Example 3. A quantum channel of the form (1.1), where $m = n$ and (1.2) holds, is called a strongly self-adjoint if there exists a permutation π on $\{1, \ldots, l\}$ such that $A_i^* = A_{\pi(i)}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, l$. So $\mathbf{A}(\tau) = I_n$ and $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) = 1$. Note that τ is self-adjoint and $\tau(I_n) = I_n$. Since I_n is an interior point of $\mathcal{S}_{n,+}$ it follows that $\sigma_1(\tau) = 1$.

Example 4. Assume $\tau_j : \mathcal{S}_{n_j}(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathcal{S}_{m_j}(\mathbb{C}), j = 1, 2$ are two quantum channels. Consider the quantum channel $\tau = \tau_1 \otimes \tau_2$. Then

$$\log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) = \log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau_1)) + \log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau_2)), \ \log \sigma_1(\tau) = \log \sigma_1(\tau_1) + \log \sigma_1(\tau_2).$$

Thus, it is possible to have $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) < 1$ without the assumption that both τ_1 and τ_2 satisfy the same condition. Combine Example 1 and Example 3 to obtain examples of quantum channels $\tau : \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathcal{S}_{mn}(\mathbb{C})$, where $n, m > 1$ where $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) < 1$. Similar arguments apply for $\sigma_1(\tau)$.

Example 5. Recall that if $B \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ and $C \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times q}$ then

$$B \oplus C = \begin{bmatrix} B & 0_{m \times q} \\ 0_{p \times n} & C \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{(m+p) \times (n+q)}.$$

Assume $\tau_j : \mathcal{S}_{n_j}(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathcal{S}_{m_j}(\mathbb{C}), j = 1, 2$ are two quantum channels given as in (4.2). Then $\tau_1 \oplus \tau_2 : \mathcal{S}_{n_1+n_2}(\mathbb{C}) :\to \mathcal{S}_{m_1+m_2}(\mathbb{C})$ is defined as follows.

$$(\tau_1 \oplus \tau_2)(X) = \sum_{i_1=i_2=1}^{l_1, l_2} (A_{i_1,1} \oplus A_{i_2,2}) X (A_{i_1}^* \oplus A_{i_2,2}^*).$$

Clearly, $\tau_1 \oplus \tau_2$ is a quantum channel. Furthermore,

$$\mathbf{A}(\tau_1 \oplus \tau_2) = \mathbf{A}(\tau_1) \oplus \mathbf{A}(\tau_2).$$

Hence

$$\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau_1 \oplus \tau_2)) = \max(\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau_1)), \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau_2))). \tag{5.6}$$

This if $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau_i)) < 1$ we get that $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau_1 \oplus \tau_2) < 1$.

The formula for $\sigma_1(\tau_1 \oplus \tau_2)$ does not seems to be as simple as (5.6). By viewing $\mathcal{S}_{n_1}(\mathbb{C}) \oplus \mathcal{S}_{n_2}(\mathbb{C})$ as a subspace of $\mathcal{S}_{n_1+n_2}(\mathbb{C})$ we deduce the inequality

$$\sigma_1(\tau_1 \oplus \tau_2) \geq \max(\sigma_1(\tau_1), \sigma_1(\tau_2)).$$

Example 6. We first show how to take a neighborhood of a given quantum channel given by (1.1). View $\mathcal{A} := (A_1, \ldots, A_l)$ as a point in $(\mathbb{C}^{m\times n})^l$. Let $\mathrm{O}(\mathcal{A}) \subset (\mathbb{C}^{m\times n})^l$ be an open neighborhood of $\mathcal{A}$ such that for any $\mathcal{B} := (B_1, \ldots, B_l) \in (\mathbb{C}^{m\times n})^l$ the matrix $C(\mathcal{B}) := \sum_{i=1}^l B_i^* B_i$ has positive eigenvalues. Define

$$\hat{\mathcal{B}} = (\hat{B}_1, \ldots, \hat{B}_l) = (B_1 C(\mathcal{B})^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \ldots, B_l C(\mathcal{B})^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \in (\mathbb{C}^{m\times n})^l.$$

Then $\tau_{\mathcal{B}} : \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C})$ given by

$$\tau_{\mathcal{B}}(X) = \sum_{i=1}^l \hat{B}_i X (\hat{B}_i)^*$$

is a quantum channel. So if $O(\mathcal{A})$ is a small neighborhood $\mathcal{A}$ then $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}$ is in the small neighborhood of τ. In particular of $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) < 1$ then there exists a small neighborhood $O(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau_{\mathcal{B}})) < 1$ for each $\mathcal{B} \in O(\mathcal{A})$. Similar claim holds if $\sigma_1(\tau) < 1$.

6 Bi-quantum channels

Theorem 6.1 *Let $\tau : \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C})$ be a bi-quantum channel. Then $\sigma_1(\tau) = 1$. Assume that $n \geq 2$ and $\sigma_2(\tau) < 1$. Then*

$$\mathrm{H}(\tau) \geq -\frac{1}{2}\log(\sigma_2(\tau)^2 + \frac{1-\sigma_2(\tau)^2}{n}). \tag{6.1}$$

Proof. Observe first that since τ and τ^* are quantum channels if follows that $\omega := \tau^*\tau$ is a self-adjoint quantum channel on $\mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C})$. As ω preserves the cone of positive hermitian matrices, $\omega(I_n) = I_n$ and I_n is an interior point of $\mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{C})$, the Krein-Milman theorem, e.g. [1], it follows that 1 is the maximal eigenvalue of ω. Hence $\sigma_1(\tau) = 1$. Observe next

$$\lambda_1(\tau(\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^*)) \leq (\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(\tau(\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^*))^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \|\tau(\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^*)\|.$$

We now estimate $\|\tau(\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^*)\|$ from above, assuming that $\|\mathbf{x}\| = 1$. Consider the singular value decomposition of τ given by (3.1-3.2). Here $m = n$ and we can assume that $U_1 = V_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} I_n$. (3.3) yields that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(\tau(\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^*))^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathrm{rank}\,\tau} \sigma_i(\tau)^2 |\operatorname{tr} U_i \mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^*|^2 \leq \sigma_1(\tau)^2 |\operatorname{tr} U_1 \mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^*|^2 + \sum_{i=2}^{\mathrm{rank}\,\tau} \sigma_2(\tau)^2 |\operatorname{tr} U_i \mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^*|^2.$$

Since $\sigma_1(\tau) = 1$ and $\operatorname{tr} U_1 \mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^* = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^* = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$, we deduce that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(\tau(\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^*))^2 \leq \sigma_2(\tau)^2 + \frac{1-\sigma_2(\tau)^2}{n}. \tag{6.2}$$

So

$$\lambda_1(\tau(\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \sqrt{\sigma_2(\tau)^2 + \frac{1-\sigma_2(\tau)^2}{n}}.$$

Use the arguments of the proof of Theorem 4.1 to deduce (6.1). □

Proposition 6.2 *Let $\tau_i : \mathcal{S}_{n_i}(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathcal{S}_{n_i}(\mathbb{C})$ be a bi-quantum channel for $i = 1, 2$. Then $\tau_1 \otimes \tau_2$ is a bi-channel. Furthermore*

$$\sigma_2(\tau_1 \otimes \tau_2) = \max(\sigma_2(\tau_1), \sigma_2(\tau_2)). \tag{6.3}$$

In particular, if $\tau : \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C})$ is a unitary channel and $\sigma_2(\tau) < 1$ then

$$\mathrm{H}(\otimes^p \tau) \geq -\frac{1}{2} \log(\sigma_2(\tau)^2 + \frac{1 - \sigma_2(\tau)^2}{n^p}). \tag{6.4}$$

Proof. Since $(\tau_1 \otimes \tau_2)^* = \tau_1^* \otimes \tau_2^*$ it follows that a tensor product of two bi-quantum channels is a bi-quantum channel. Since the singular values of $\tau_1 \otimes \tau_2$ are all possible products of of singular values of τ_1 and τ_2 we deduce (6.3). Then (6.4) is implied by Theorem 6.1. $\square$

Lemma 6.3 *Consider a unitary channel of the form (1.1) and (1.7), where $l \geq 3$, $t_i \neq 0, i = 1, \ldots, l$, $Q_1 = I_n$, and $Q_2, \ldots, Q_l$ do not have a common nontrivial invariant subspace. Then $\sigma_2(\tau) < \sigma_1(\tau) = 1$.*

Proof. Assume that $X \in \mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{C})$ has rank $k \in [1, n-1]$. We claim that $\operatorname{rank} \tau(X) > \operatorname{rank} X$. Recall that $X = \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{x}_j \mathbf{x}_j^*$, where $\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_k \in \mathbb{C}^n$ are nonzero orthogonal vectors. As $t_1^2, \ldots, t_k^2 > 0$ we deduce that

$$\tau(X) = t_1^2 X + \sum_{j=2}^k t_j^2 Q_j X Q_j^* \geq t_1^2 X.$$

So $\operatorname{rank} \tau(X) \geq k$. Furthermore $\operatorname{rank} \tau(X) = k$ if and only $Q_i \mathbf{x}_j \in \mathbf{U} := \operatorname{span}(\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_k)$ for $i = 2, \ldots, l$ and $j = 1, \ldots, k$. Since $\mathbf{U}$ is not invariant under $Q_2, \ldots, Q_l$ we deduce that $\operatorname{rank} \tau(X) > k$. Clearly, if $Y \geq 0$ and $\operatorname{rank} Y = n$ then $\operatorname{rank} \tau(Y) = n$.

Observe next that $Q_2^*, \ldots, Q_l^*$ do not have a nontrivial common invariant subspace. Indeed, if $\mathbf{V} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ was a nontrivial common invariant of $Q_2^*, \ldots, Q_l^*$, then the orthogonal complement of $\mathbf{V}$ will be a nontrivial invariant subspace of $Q_2, \ldots, Q_l$, which contradicts our assumption. Hence $\tau^*(X) > \operatorname{rank} X$.

Let $\eta = \tau^* \tau$. Thus, $\operatorname{rank} \eta^n(Z) = n$ for any $Z \gneq 0$, i.e., η^n maps $\mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{C}) \backslash \{0\}$ to the interior of $\mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{C})$. By Krein-Milman theorem, i.e. [1], $1 = \lambda_1(\eta^n) > \lambda_2(\eta^n) = \sigma_2(\tau)^{2n}$. $\square$

Corollary 6.4 *Let $\tau : \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C})$ be a generic unitary quantum channel. I.e. τ of the form (1.1) and (1.7), where $l \geq 3$, $(t_1^2, \ldots, t_l^2)^\top$ is a random probability vector, and $Q_1, \ldots, Q_l$ are random unitary matrices. Then $\sigma_2(\tau) < \sigma_1(\tau) = 1$.*

Proof. Let $\tau_1(X) := \tau(Q_1^* X Q_1)$. Clearly, the $l-1$ unitary matrices $Q_2 Q_1^*, \ldots, Q_l Q_1^*$ are $l-1$ random unitary matrices. Since $l - 1 \geq 2$ these $l-1$ matrices do not have a nontrivial common invariant subspace. Lemma 6.3 yields that $\sigma_2(\tau_1) < 1$. Clearly, $\sigma_2(\tau_1) = \sigma_2(\tau)$. $\square$

References

[1] A. Berman and R.J. Plemmons, *Nonnegative Matrices in the Matematical Sciences*, Academic Press 1979.

[2] H. Derksen, S. Friedland, G. Gour, D. Gross, L. Gurvits, A. Roy, and J. Yard, On minimum entropy output and the additivity conjecture, Notes of Quantum Information Group, American Mathematical Institute workshop "Geometry and representation theory of tensors for computer science, statistics and other areas", July 21-25, 2008.

[3] S. Friedland, Convex spectral functions, *Linear Multilin. Algebra* 9 (1981), 299-316.

[4] S. Friedland and U.N. Peled, Theory of Computation of Multidimensional Entropy with an Application to the Monomer-Dimer Problem, *Advances of Applied Math.* 34(2005), 486-522.

[5] G.H. Hardy, J.E. Littlewood and G. Pólya, *Inequalities*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Second edition, 1952.

[6] M. B. Hastings, A counterexample to additivity of minimum output entropy, arXiv:0809.3972v2 [quant-ph].

[7] R.A. Horn and C.R. Johnson, *Topics in Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, 1999.

[8] P. Hayden and A. Winter, Counterexamples to maximal p-norm multiplicativity conjecture, arXiv: 0807.4753v1 [quant-ph] 30 July, 2008.

[9] A.W. Marshall and I. Olkin, *Inequalities: Theory of Majorization and Its Application*, Academic Press, 1979.

[10] P.W. Shor, Equivalence of additivity questions in quantum information theory, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 246 (2004), 453-472, arXiv:quant-ph/030503v4, 3 July 2003.

Acknowledgement: I thank Gilad Gour for useful remarks.